

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
Serial No.: 10/748,178
Filed: December 31, 2003
Office Action Mailing Date: June 3, 2008

Examiner: Thomas A. GYORFI
Group Art Unit: 2135
Attorney Docket: 27153

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-146 are in this Application. Claims 81-106 and 131-146 are cancelled.

Claim 130 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 1-75 and 76-129, 147 and 148 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1, 66, 73, 107, 110 and 130 have been amended herewith. .

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Claim 130 has been amended to include the same features as the remaining independent claims. It is therefore believed that the 102 rejection to Ronning is overcome since Ronning does not have any issue of identifying unknown information to find out whether it has an associated policy. He always receives the information with the policy. Any further issue relating to Ronning in view of Lacan is likewise overcome at least for the same reasons as for the other claims, detailed under the 103 heading below.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1-72 and 110-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ginter et al. (US Patent No. 5,892,900), hereinafter "Ginter", in view of Lacan et al (US Patent 7,370,366) hereinafter "Lacan"..

Claims 73-75, 78-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of by Ronning (US Patent No. 5,903,647), hereinafter "Ronning" in view of Lacan..

Claims 107-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being obvious in light of "Java Security: How to Install the Security Manager and Customize Your Security Policy" (hereinafter "Venners") in view of Lacan.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
Serial No.: 10/748,178
Filed: December 31, 2003
Office Action Mailing Date: June 3, 2008

Examiner: Thomas A. GYORFI
Group Art Unit: 2135
Attorney Docket: 27153

I. General comments on Lacan

Lacan is cited by the Examiner as evidence of the general use of techniques of statistical analysis to identify confidential information in one's data.

The Examiner cites Lacan Col. 6 lines 5 – 20, which indeed carries out statistical analysis on confidential data. There is no indication in this passage however that the statistical analysis is for the purpose of *identifying unknown* data to determine whether it is confidential data. It certainly does not teach the combination of using statistical analysis to identify unknown data for confidentiality.

The Examiner further cites Lacan Col. 6 lines 50 – col 7 line 20. This passage indeed talks about keeping specific data confidential but does not mention using statistical analysis and neither does it teach identifying *unknown* data as being confidential. . It certainly does not teach the combination of using statistical analysis to identify unknown data for confidentiality.

The Examiner further cites Lacan Col. 8 lines 5 – 15. This passage teaches a data analysis system being tested on fake data until it produces results above a threshold so that confidentiality may be preserved. The system referred to in this passage appears to be that discussed in the preceding passage in which experts identify data and sign it using a hash. Thus the data analysis system is not statistical at all but rather is simply a signature interrogation system. It certainly does not teach the combination of using statistical analysis to identify unknown data for confidentiality.

II. Amendments to the main claims

The independent claims have been amended to cover the *identification* of *unknown* data by *statistical comparison* with a *database of content identifiers* of the confidential data, thereby allowing the confidential data to be identified and then the corresponding policy to be acted upon, specifically:

“using *identifiers* from an *identifier database*,
performing a *statistical analysis of content in use by said user* in
association with a given monitored action, to identify confidential

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al.
Serial No.: 10/748,178
Filed: December 31, 2003
Office Action Mailing Date: June 3, 2008

Examiner: Thomas A. GYORFI
Group Art Unit: 2135
Attorney Docket: 27153

information in said content, given confidential information being associated with respective predefined policies;”

No such combination is taught in Lacan for the reasons given above. No such combination is taught by the combination of Ginter and Lacan, or Ronning and Lacan, or Venners and Lacan, since neither Ginter nor Ronning nor Lacan use statistical analysis on a database of identifiers in order to identify confidential information from unknown information being used. This missing information is not taught or suggested in Lacan which does not even use statistical analysis of a database of identifiers. Rather it appears to use signatures provided with the data and there is no identification of unknown data.

No new matter has been added in the course of making the present amendments. Specifically, support for the identifiers and the database is to be found, e.g., in paragraph 0313: “In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the client is operable to detect confidential information, based on statistical identifiers resides in a specialized database. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the the specialized database resides on a secure server. FIG. 6 illustrates a system, substantially similar to the system of FIG. 1, where a content identifier 180 is used in order to identify the content, possibly using the information stored in the content identifier database 182. The results of the identification process are transferred to the policy reference monitor 132, possibly with an accompanying "confidence level" that represents the amount of uncertainty in the identification. “

It is believed that all of the matters raised by the Examiner are overcome.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-80, 107-130, 147 and 148 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: October 29, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension (Two Months)
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)